

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action mailed May 13, 2011, the Examiner took the following actions:

- (1) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,064,424 to van Berkel et al. ("Berkel"); and
- (2) rejected claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berkel in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA");

By this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 14, 16, and 18-20.

Support for the amendments can be found in the specification, for example, from page 15, line 25 to page 17, line 5, and on page 20, lines 9-27. Claims 1-20 remain pending and under current examination. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections made in the Final Office Action.

I. **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Berkel. In order to establish anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Final Office Action must show that each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in Berkel. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. Berkel, however, does not disclose each and every element of Applicants' claims.

Contrary to the Examiner's allegations, Berkel does *not* disclose at least Applicants' claimed "stereoscopic image data structure" that comprises, among other things:

a parallax component image data representing n or more parallax component images, each having accumulated pixels that cause the pixels to generate parallel light rays in a respective parallax direction in a viewing zone, and each having a different number of horizontal pixels,

wherein the parallax interleaved image is formed by combining n combined images, each combined image having a same number of vertical pixels as the number of horizontal pixels,

wherein each combined image is formed by combining one or more parallax component images with parallax directions different from each other by n.

as recited in amended claim 1.

The Final Office Action continues to interpret Berkel's "colour pixels re-arranged," illustrated in Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B, as corresponding to the claimed "parallax component image." Final Office Action, p. 3. This interpretation is incorrect. In contrast, Berkel is silent about the "parallax component image" and "parallax interleaved image," as recited by amended claim 1.

First, although Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B of Berkel show that "[t]he display elements in one row of the array of the LC display panel ... all display the same colour," col. 11, ll. 9-11, Berkel does not disclose or suggest "accumulated pixels that cause the pixels to generate parallel light rays in a respective parallax direction in the viewing zone," as recited in claim 1. Nor does Berkel disclose or suggest that each parallax component image has "a different number of horizontal pixels." In contrast, Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B of Berkel show that the number of horizontal pixels in each lenticule 16 is identical.

Furthermore, Fig. 5A and Fig. 5B of Berkel do not disclose or suggest that "the parallax interleaved image is formed by combining n combined images," as recited by

claim 1. The Final Office Action alleges that the “r, g, b in dashed lines in the fig. 5B” as correspond the “n combined images.” Final Office Action, p. 3. However, Berkel in Fig. 5B does not show “n” images, where “n” is an integer number equal to a ratio between “the second horizontal pitch” and “the first horizontal pitch,” as recited by claim 1. Furthermore, none of those dashed-lined blocks shown in Fig. 5B of Berkel is “square” as they do not have “a same number of vertical pixels as the number of horizontal pixels,” as recited by claim 1. Nor are these dashed-lined blocks “formed by combining one or more parallax component images with **parallax directions different from each other by n,**” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added).

For at least the above reasons, Berkel fails to disclose or suggest each and every recitation of amended claim 1. As such, Berkel does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), and the claim should therefore be allowed.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Berkel and AAPA. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to the amended claims.

As noted above, Berkel fails to disclose or suggest all of the claim recitations of independent claim 1. Independent claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20, while of different scope, include recitations similar to those discussed above regarding independent claim 1. For example, claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20 each recite “a parallax component image.” Therefore, Berkel does not disclose or suggest all of the claim recitations of each of independent claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20. Furthermore, AAPA was cited by the

Examiner merely for allegedly disclosing that the "n combined images is recorded."

December 22, 2010, Office Action, p. 8. Therefore, AAPA does not cure the deficiencies of Berkel identified above and thus claims 2, 14, 16, and 18-20 are allowable over Berkel and AAPA.

Dependent claims 3-13, 15, and 17 are not obvious over the cited references, at least by virtue of being dependent from allowable independent claims 2, 14, and 16, and because they recite additional features not taught or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 13, 2011

By:



Jiayu Song
Ltd. Rec. No. L0500
(202) 408-4464